

# Christian Reflector.

Fear God and give glory to Him. All Scripture is profitable. God hath made of one blood all nations of men.

VOL. 4.—No. 5.—Whole No. 136.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1841.

CYRUS P. GROSVENOR, Editor.

TO THE REV. R. FULLER, BEAUFORT, S. C.

Rev. and Dear Brother:—The late period at which your public letter, addressed to me through the "Biblical Recorder and Southern Watchman," and copied into the "Christian Reflector," came to hand, and the imperious duties which have since occupied my attention, have prevented an earlier answer. Having attentively and repeatedly read your communication, and made its author the subject of daily prayer, after again and again imporing Divine direction, I take up my pen to reply. So much deference have I deemed to be due to the appeal of an individual, whom I highly respect and sincerely love. Permit me, my Dear Brother, affectionately to ask, whether you should have given less serious attention to a grave and kind "address" from the representatives of hundreds of your ministering, and thousands of your lay brethren, who for months and years, have wept and prayed over the subject of their solemn exhortation? Yet it is apparent, that the same day on which you received it, your answer was mailed. Truly did you say, "I have written very hastily."

Your letter excited, in my bosom mingled emotions of joy and sorrow, but in great disproportion;—the former was "as the drop of the bucket,"—the latter as an overflowing fountain. I was gratified by a frank avowal of your respect and affection for one, whose sentiments, on so important a subject as the moral character of American Slavery, differ from your own too coldly; and I assure you, those feelings are most cordially reciprocated.

But I was overwhelmed with grief and astonishment, at your directly charging upon the ever blessed God, upon the Holy Ghost, an "express" sanction of a system of injustice and cruelty, at which every unbiased mind recoils—and from which every uncorrupted feeling of human nature recoils. If any thing were wanting in the degree of my abhorrence, it should seem sufficient to fill up the full measure of my detestation of slavery, thus to witness its deplorable effects upon a mind, in other respects, so pure and enlightened, and upon a heart, on other subjects, so generous and sympathetic. Alas! this is one more sad evidence of the invariable tendency of every moral evil to conceal its true character from all who are subject to its influence.

Earnestly praying that the God of infinite wisdom will give us both understanding, I proceed to notice the several statements embraced in your letter.

You "confess" that, on receiving "the Address of the American [Baptist] Antislavery Convention, your first impulse was to recoil." Permit me, in humility, to ask, whether that impulse indicates a right state of mind on the subject, a suitable openness to conviction, or a proper desire to know the whole truth? So far from feeling such an impulse, in regard to your reply, I sought it with avidity, from the first moment I was aware of its existence. By using the word "confess," you seem to intimate that, on a "sober second thought," you perceived that the feeling was wrong;—and yet you apologize for it by saying,—"I have again and again received pamphlets on the subject of slavery, and have felt only sorrow and forgiveness, as I read the abuse and calumny, emptied with cornucopia lavishment upon Christians at the South." I beg you to review this sentence;—for, in point of candor, it appears to me that your apology is not much in advance of your "first impulse." Are you quite sure that, in thus reading and thus writing, you "have felt only sorrow and forgiveness?"

You assure us, that you are "content to appeal to God" [in justification of slavery.] Remember, my Dear Brother, that this whole nation, Christians, ministers and all, once unitedly appealed to God for the truth of what you deny. They declared that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, LIBERTY and the pursuit of happiness." You, on the contrary, virtually declare, "that all men are not endowed by their Creator, with such inalienable rights,—that all men have not a natural right to liberty;" and so, both parties have appealed to the same awful tribunal. Without inquiring, at present, which of these antagonist appeals is ratified by the great Arbitrator, I submit that, if you are "content" with your own appeal, you ought to abide by its principles;—and, as your own liberty as a man, and especially as an American, is based on the principles of the national appeal which you thus repudiate, consistency requires you to abandon all claim to your civil freedom and dutifully tender your neck to the British yoke.

You dwell upon the pleasure of laboring, praying, singing, and communing with fifteen hundred slaves; as though that were some part or parcel of slavery, which should commend it to our regard, or which reconciles you to it, and justifies you in supporting it; whereas, there is nothing in the genius, the laws, the spirit or tendency of the institution, to produce any such state of things; but entirely the contrary. All which you describe as lovely, is to be attributed to humanity and religion, pushing their conquests into the empire of slavery. Surely, it is not against this that we remonstrate; but against the violation of the immutable and eternal principles of justice, and the benevolent spirit of the gospel, by holding immortal, accountable beings,—yea the members of Christ's mystical body, in the condition of brutes—as articles of property—subject to the will of their reputed owners. Does it not detract at all from the pleasure of your kind heart, to know that those fifteen hundred fellow-Christians, for whom the Savior died, are, by your consent and with your approbation, held in a state in which your own statute book declares, they "shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be, chattels personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, and executors, administrators, and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever?" And does it not diminish your holy joy, on their behalf, to reflect that you, the minister of God's mercy and the servant of him who came to "proclaim liberty to the captives," hold some of them in that identical condition? Think of our Savior's words,—in as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Would you dare to hold the person of Jesus Christ in the condition in which you hold his acknowledged representatives?

O! my Brother, I am pained for you. Think again, that while you are satisfying your conscience with your good treatment of fifteen hundred slaves in your congregation, you are not only warring against the order which JEMOAH has established, by holding his rational creatures, "made in his own image," in the rank of unaccountable and unresponsive things; but you are, also, lending the whole weight of your example, your influence, your Christian character and ministerial dignity, to sanction and support the principle of human chattelship, which gives to irreligious slaveholders all the power by which they not only *maintain*, but *deny* the means of salvation to, not merely *fifteen hundred*, but more than *FIFTY HUNDRED THOUSAND*, priceless souls—of whom the Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia (speaking of the slave population in general—not of exceptions) have, by their Committee, said, "they will bear a comparison with the heathen in any country in the world." It is at the master's option, whether his slaves shall know the name of God, or Christ, or Heaven, or Hell.

As to your responsibility for the conduct of ungodly masters, the question is not so much what they do, or do not, to their slaves, as what the property principle, which

you sanction, authorizes and tempts them to do;—and what it forbids and requires its victims to do. That principle, by clothing the master with irresponsible power, and giving him unlimited jurisdiction over the slave, allows him to do any thing to him which he has a right to do with his horse,—while it allows the slave no redress—no appeal. It regards him not as a rational and moral being, but as a physical—a brute being. Judge Stroud, in his "Sketch of the Laws relating to Slavery," says, "The radical principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings, but among things, obtains, as undoubted law, in all these [the slave] States." Hence the oath of any number of slaves would not convict a white man of any crime, in your own, or any other slave state. Hence, too, the late decision of the Methodist Conference, that the testimony of slaves, though members of the church, is not to be admitted in their ecclesiastical courts. After the denial to human beings of their manhood, their right to themselves, and the exercise of what good treatment, while they are held in that degrading and God-provoking condition, can make amends for the outrage? To reduce a man to a chattel, and then attempt to treat him as a man, while retaining him in that preposterous relation, is like an effort to sustain a superstructure after knocking out the foundation,—or to buoy a bottomless vessel by working her pumps. The question between us is one of relation, not of treatment in that relation. For illustration, let us take a hypothetical case, in which both of us alike abhor the relation as wicked.

Suppose that my congregation were living in a state of concubinage,—that the practice were sanctioned by public opinion and by the laws of the state,—that I and my church were living in that connection with good reputation,—that "fifteen hundred" of the females were hopelessly converted, admitted to the church and communion,—that you should remonstrate against the practice, and refuse to fellowship me in the continuance of it, after suitable admonition;—and that I should tell you that I prayed and sung, and wept and communed with "fifteen hundred" of those women every ordinance day,—that "they loved me as their pastor, and I loved them as sisters in Christ"—would you be satisfied with the relation, because I treated them kindly, and we mutually loved each other? Or would you not cry out against the criminality of the relation which I sustained, and justified my brethren in sustaining, to such degraded beings? And would you not lift up your voice like a trumpet, to inveigh against my conduct, if those wretched beings had been brought into that unholy relation forcibly, and were held by me, as well as by others, in involuntary subjection to my will, and I would advise, pursue, recover, and punish those who should make their escape? Or would you be satisfied by my pleading patriarchal example, or their contentment;—or, (to use your own language in regard to the state of the slave, with slight modifications) by my saying, the concubine "is in the happiest situation she can occupy; and with a humane paramour, she has far less labor, much greater privileges, more leisure, and practically more chastity, than any unmarried woman in the world?" Would you not consider the fact, that the influence of their condition had so debased their minds and perverted their consciences, as to render them contented therein, as the clearest evidence of the sinfulness of the relation itself? Nor would you allow that all their alleged "privileges," in the least degree, cancelled the guilt of any man who should support such a connection. Ten thousand good acts cannot justify a single transgression;—nor can the piety, or religious enjoyment of those who either do or suffer wrong, change the nature of that wrong, any more than the merchant's praying over his sanded sugar purifies that article, or annihilates the sin of adulterating it. Yet the greater the moral worth, and the less exceptionable the general character of an individual, the more deleterious the influence of his example, in countenancing any error, into which, by the force of circumstance he may have unhappily fallen. Hence your endorsement of the system of American Slavery, does more towards giving it respectability and perpetuity, than that of scores of irreligious and cruel masters. The multitude will look at slavery in the light of your piety, rather than in the darkness of its principles. You cannot know, my Dear Brother, how deeply I lament that the moral excellence and amiable deportment of one so highly and so justly respected and loved, should thus be the unwilling occasion of riveting the chains and prolonging the sufferings of millions of slaves! But for the countenance of Christians, Slavery would soon be numbered among the things that were.

The foregoing illustration may not appear irrelevant, permit me to remark that there is no want of affinity between the relation there noticed and that of slavery.—Whatever your piety and humanity may have done to check or prevent the evils naturally arising from the chattel principle, in your own vicinity, still you must be aware that "the best blood in Virginia" (and might I not add, in South Carolina, too?) runs in the veins of slaves.—Who does not know that slavery is the hot-bed of licentiousness? Were there not thousands of melancholy facts to establish this point—it would still be self evident, that the irresponsible control of the woman-buyer, over the naturally weaker sex, in view of human depravity, inevitably leads to such lamentable results. Therefore, in estimating the character of American Slavery, by the conduct of Masters, you must take into the account the bad, as well as the good treatment of slaves; rather you ought to leave out of the question, altogether, the good fruits of other trees growing in the same garden, or other principles counteracting that of slavery. All who support the system of human chattelship, are co-partners in the firm and mutually responsible for each other's conduct, so far as it is warranted by the principles of the compact. If you were connected with a piratical combination and shared in the spoils, you would be accountable for the murders committed by the savage portion of the crew, although you should personally treat those whom you robbed, in many respects, with kindness;—even, if you should instruct and pray with them, and do many things for their comfort. The unrighteous principles of the confederacy, to which you gave your consent and support, and out of which violence naturally arose, would involve you in the guilt of all those acts of barbarity, committed by your partners, which in their view, were necessary to the safe and successful prosecution of the enterprise. If, with a knowledge of the facts, you only received a share of the plunder, you would be justly regarded as an accessory in the whole affair, and a portion of the blood of its victims would crimson your skirts. So, by being connected with wicked men in the support of slavery, by partaking of the avails of involuntary servitude and the sale of human beings, for the purpose of securing which the more effectually, others in the association rend asunder all the tender ties of consanguinity and Heaven-appointed wedlock, and practice unutterable wrongs—you are, to a great extent, responsible for the conduct of your partners; while they act legitimately, as they do, upon the property principle, which is the foundation of the system, and which places the slave, without the least reference to his own good, entirely at the disposal of the Master.

Again, I cannot but think, my Dear Brother, that you are not the less certainly, though more remotely and unconsciously, accessory to the crime and wickedness produced by kidnapping;—and also to the almost unparallel-

ed horrors of the African and the American slave-trade. To the former branch of this execrable traffic, about three hundred thousand immortal fellow beings are annually sacrificed. It is computed that one third of this number perish in the wars engendered to supply the market;—another third die by suffocation and other causes on the passage; and the remainder are consigned to hopeless and interminable bondage;—while the domestic "trade" in the bodies and souls of men" subjects, at least, a quarter of a million of American-born men, women and children to the most heart-rending separations from kindred and acquaintances, and to the dredded hardships and sufferings of Southern and Western plantations, every seven years.

Of all these poisonous fruits of slavery, the "chattel" principle is the deadly germ. Pluck that out of the system, and it will wither and die, like the fig-tree smitten by the Savior's curse. By sustaining that principle, you are nourishing the root; the Bohns Ups, increasing its vigor, and perpetuating its growth;—for, while there is a market, there will be a supply;—while there are men-buyers, there will be men-catchers;—and, while there are men-holders, there will be men-traders. The same principle is involved in each act, in the whole process.

It is impossible for me to conceive that your own slaves are held by any better tenure, than that by which the original manstealer held the victims of his violence, his avarice, or his intrigue. It is derived from the same source. He could confer no better title than he possessed;—and so of every successive vendor, down to him who transferred his title to yourself. What then, I ask, in the name of Justice, my Brother, is your title? If your slaves are the remote descendants of stolen men, the original title could be no better to the offspring, than to the parents; and the title to the issue comes through their progenitors, throughout the whole concatenation of usurpations and assumptions. If your slaves come to you by legacy, or by gift, it should not be forgotten that no man has a right to give or bequeath what is not his own. By holding your slaves by a title thus derived, do you not practically sanction that original act of violence, which this nation has declared to the world, to be "piracy and treason," and to which declaration the Governments of Europe have responded—Amen? Men, whom God placed in the scale of being next to the Angels, have been thrust down to the rank of brutes and things, and by constraint are retained in that condition, from generation to generation. And alas! My Dear Brother F. feels justified in holding property in his Godlike fellow beings, by such a tenure. Should their Maker show you a full map of your inherited or purchased possession, (as he will in the light of eternity,) its length, its breadth, its height, its depth, its imperishable nature, and its inestimable value, would you not be convinced of one sin, at least, in the affair—that of buying it too cheap!

After expatiating upon your ministerial labors among your slaves, you ask, what we, "at the North, have done for their souls?" I reply that, as we are not permitted to go to them, whenever they have come to us, we have done what we could, both for "their souls," and their bodies too. We have sympathized with them, prayed with them, instructed them, fed and clothed them, and "let them dwell among us, where it liketh them best." In turn I ask you, in candor, what more we could "have done for their souls," while they are under keepers, some of whom have set a price upon our heads, and who, by legal enactments, have attached heavy penalties to the crime of giving them the Bible or any other book, or pamphlet, or of teaching them to read? Do you say, oral instruction is sufficient for their salvation? So say the Roman Catholics, who have taken away from the people the key of knowledge. And like them you will not allow us freely to give them even that oral instruction, lest we should divulge the dangerous secret, that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men"—or lest we should, in the language of His word, say to Masters, "let the oppressed go free—break every yoke." Even your own Missionary (Turpin,) in giving oral religious instruction to the slaves of your own state, drew forth, in 1838, a remonstrance signed by James Pope and 352 other citizens of the districts of Abbeville and Edgefield, S. C., the ground of which was, that "knowledge is power"—and that "intelligence and slavery have no affinity for each other."

But you say, in justification of our exclusion from that field of labor, that we "warn" you, that we "will send ministers to say,—servants, your masters are tyrants and pirates—obey them not;—Missionaries of hatred, and insubordination, and blood-shed." Surely, this is not the language of Brother Fuller!—No, I will not lay it to his charge—He is too good a man. It is the language of the Demon of Slavery, uttering through that dear servant of God, unkind, uncandid, unfounded charges against "the brethren," as did their ancient "accuser." Ask that false spirit, my brother, when?—where?—and who? of us, have warned you that we would send such ministers—to teach such things? We have never felt, certainly not expressed to you, a desire or intention to teach your slaves "insubordination and bloodshed"—but we have always said, that it is their duty to bear their afflictions patiently, and leave their cause with God. Our appeals, in regard to their wrongs, have never been to them, but to you—to the humane—and to Heaven. We have always repudiated the idea of a resort to violence. We are all non-assaults, and most of us non-resistants. And as to hatred, we are fully aware that there is no need of teaching that any where.

You advise that "the money expended in printing inflammatory libels, be sent to any one at the South, and to let him select preachers for your slaves," &c. In regard to libels, if the doctrine be true that "the greater the truth, the greater the libel," then in that respect, we are verily guilty. But, if by "libels" you mean falsehoods, then be it known to you that "we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our witness." But "any one at the South," you seem to regard as competent to select ministers, to expend our money, in teaching your slaves, among better things, necessarily, that they are "chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors, and executors, administrators, and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." We are of opinion, however, that it is more consistent for us to apply our funds, which are to be expended in this Christian land, to those who will preach the whole gospel, where it is neither heresy nor treason to teach the ignorant to read God's own word for themselves, and where Christians do not combine with others, to interpose statutory prohibitions of obedience to the command of our Lord, "Search the Scriptures."—You say, our "object is not salvation, but emancipation."—notwithstanding we have uniformly avowed both objects, and have desired the latter the more devoutly, as the only means of removing the obstacles which slavery has thrust in the way of the former.

But you "ascribe not to the most violent [of us] evil motives." A stretch of charity indeed! We are charged with an avowed intention to send among you "Missionaries of hatred, insubordination and blood-shed"—of "printing inflammatory libels"—and of disguising our object,—all from good motives? Do you do such things at the South, from good motives? "We have not so learned Christ."

But you impute much to our ignorance of the subject, and admit that, had you been "born in Boston or New York, you would think as we do." Yes, my brother, you would think thus, had you been born any where in this wide world, if the incubus of slavery had never brooded on your conscience. Do you inquire, why then some persons born at the North, become slaveholders so soon after removing to the South? I answer, that it is easy for men to adapt their views and practice to their apparent interests, while nothing but truth and justice can induce them to relinquish wealth, and power, and prerogatives, as many have done (in nearly all of the slaveholding states,) by emancipation, in opposition to the influence of education, public opinion, popular favor, the feelings of friends, the love of ease, and the desire of affluence. Let all at the South be convinced (as they eventually will be) that slaveholding is against their interest, and they will soon change their opinion of its moral character, and cheerfully abandon the practice. Then will those who profess to retain their fellow men in bondage, from motives of compassion, readily learn that the poor creatures, by working for wages, can take care of themselves;—as the Miller, who pleaded the necessity of the poor, in justification of his custom of grinding on the Sabbath, when forbidden by his church, to receive toll on that holy day, found his most needy customers could dispense with his "merciful" labors, the moment they became unprofitable to himself. But you should not forget that Slavery formerly existed in "Boston and New York," and generally at the North; and that it has been voluntarily surrendered to the claims of justice,—tried, condemned, and executed.

You go on to account for the obtuseness of our vision upon the subject, by saying that we see, "on some visit, only the abuses" of slavery. Is it so, my brother, that you are all careful to acquaint us, on our first arrival, with its abuses—only its abuses?—and studiously conceal all its inviting features? I assure you that those of us, who have witnessed most of the legitimate workings of the system itself, abhor it most.

Another generous apology you make for us, is that we are "poisoned by declaimers—exasperated by infamous pictures, and abominable fables of horrible cruelty, and merciless barbarity, and shocking obscenity." When have you seen in us the ranking of such "poison"?—or the evidences of such "exasperation"? We are "not mad; but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." When you come among us, we do not mob or Lynch you—we do not rifle your pockets to find pro-slavery papers, as your title to "a coat of tar and feathers." We neither threaten your lives, nor hurt a hair of your heads.—We neither destroy, intercept, nor refuse to read, your communications. And if we shall fail to invite you to our desks, or our common tables, hereafter, it will not be in anger, but to bear our practical testimony against Slavery,—to avoid its contagion, and its guilt,—and, if possible, to recover our brethren from its disastrous influence. In regard to "infamous pictures," I have only to remark, that I have never seen any that surpass the originals, which are generally taken from Journals published and approved at the South. As to "abominable fables," &c.—we give the time, the place, the perpetrators, and the witnesses of the most "horrible cruelty, and merciless barbarity, and shocking obscenity," which we have either heard or published. If you are not in possession of the knowledge of such "horrible facts," you cannot have sought it with much diligence. Have you read "American Slavery as it is"—Testimony of a thousand Witnesses," most of them slaveholders? If not, I entreat you to do so. It was published in New York (Nassau st.—143,) in 1839, and is about to be republished in England, with an introduction by Lord Brougham.—We are not so very "ignorant of your Institutions,"—not so much in the dark as you imagine. The "inquisitive people" of the North are the last in the world to be ignorant of men and things. They have invented and constructed your machinery,—educated many of your sons,—studied your history, your constitutions, your laws,—examined your records,—read your public journals, and scanned your policy,—navigated your rivers,—traversed your cane fields, your cotton plantations and rice swamps. Their Argus eyes are ever upon you. Set not too much to the account of "our ignorance of your peculiar Institutions."

You express fears that the church will "be rent in twain by this topic." Should it be so, will not the responsibility rest upon those who shall be found to love power more than justice,—to love Slavery more than their brethren whom the monster crushes,—and prefer fellowship with that system of human degradation, to communion with the church of Christ?

I thank you for that respect for my unworthy "name," and that of "the many Fathers and Brethren whom you honor and love," which you assign as the only reason that our Address "was not returned." I appreciate the candor of your acknowledgment that our communication was "written (rather commenced,) in a tone and spirit of Christian affection." And I think you would have done yourself no injustice, by omitting the parenthetic modification.

Your request that we would "review the determination which we have avowed," not to hold church fellowship with persisting slaveholders, was kindly received, and duly regarded; and we assure you, that avowal has often been "reviewed," with increasing conviction of its perfect rectitude and imperious necessity.

But for your assurance that our Address was "prayerfully read," the "hasty" manner in which you dispatched your answer, as well as the tone of some of its paragraphs, would have left us in doubt of that fact.

In considering its contents, you say, you "do not design any argument on Slavery in the abstract." Do you mean by that expression, to admit that "Slavery in the abstract" is wrong?—or at least doubtful? It would seem so,—and yet, the whole aim of your argument is to justify it "in the abstract." What is Slavery in the abstract, but the principle involved in holding man as property? This is the point at issue. If it be right to hold man as property, it is right to treat him as property,—and whatever is necessary to render that property profitable, or safe, is not to be called in question. If severe inflictions be requisite to extort the labor of the reluctant slave, they are right;—and, if his love of liberty be so strong as to impel him to seek it, then it is as proper to hang upon him the heavy chain and the iron collar, as to hamper an unruly horse. If he escape, and "the rifle and hounds" are indispensable to his recovery, it is right to use them. Yea, if it be right to hold him as "property," subject to his "owner's" will, he ought to be punished in proportion to his self respect, and love of freedom; any thing to break down his spirit of manhood, and make him content with the condition of a brute, is right! On the same principle, if knowledge make him restless and unhappy, it is kindness to keep him in the grossest ignorance;—and, if the Bible would inspire him with a desire of liberty, or a consciousness of personal rights, those laws are perfectly irreprehensible, which forbid him to pry between its folded leaves. If the master's interests require the disruption of the most endearing ties, it is hard, but just. If, as you affirm, the slave is *rightful property*, and God has made him so, then every attempt to assert his humanity, is a sin against Jehovah, of which the master is his appointed avenger;—yea, every aspiration of the crushed spirit, to its heaven-born dignity, is rebellion which exposes to the pains of hell. This is "Slavery in the abstract!" and no system which embraces this principle in the abstract, can

be right in the concrete, the particular, or the aggregate. And to patronize it, is what we regard, to use your own language, "not as the cruelty of some masters, but the crime of every one." Are you startled at my conclusions? I am not less so at your premises, from which they appear to me to be inevitable.

You say, "if the question were a political one, about reducing a free people to servitude, I should oppose such an act as firmly as any man." I would ask whether that which is morally wrong in politicians, can be morally right in Christians?—Or, whether that which is wrong in inception, can be right in progression? If it be wicked to "reduce a man to involuntary servitude," it is wicked to retain him in that condition. Suppose I should rob a mother of her child and sell it to you,—and the frantic parent, being unprotected by law, should seek the recovery of her darling by an appeal to your humanity and religion;—would you console her by saying, if it were a question of stealing your child, "I should oppose such an act as firmly as any man;" but it is perfectly compatible with justice, and the spirit of the gospel, for me to retain the stolen child, for it is my property? Should she ask, did you not know that it was a stolen child, when you bought it? would you reply, surely I did, but that does not affect my right? And should she still inquire,—"had you purchased my stolen spoon, would you not be under obligation to restore it?" Would you answer, "certainly I should; but I have a legal and, therefore, a moral and religious right to the child?" What would the broken-hearted mother think of such religion? Permit me affectionately, and solemnly, to ask if you and your brethren are not in the habit of "reducing to involuntary servitude," the unoffending children of helpless mothers—children born with all the title to freedom, which God ever gave to any human being—an intellectual and moral nature—all the moral title you and I have for ourselves, and our own dear offspring? What crime have those parents or children committed to forfeit their liberty? And what right does the ruthlessness of the original robber, or those who, from generation to generation, have held under him, give you to seize the new-born innocent as your property? Do you imagine that you paid for the offspring in the purchase of the mother? I inquire, in the fear of God, whether you paid her or her Maker—the only rightful proprietors?—And if you have the full value even of the parent? No!—there never was an equivalent given for a single immortal being, save by Him who bought us with his blood.

You say, we "virtually excommunicate all who own a slave." So do you, all who sprinkle a babe. But they do it as of Divine authority, yet, as you think, without a Divine warrant. So, you hold slaves as of Divine authority, yet as I think, without Divine warrant. God has said that "a man is better than a sheep;" but you class him with the beasts of your field, and hold him by the same tenure. Your treatment of him, in other respects, has nothing to do with the question.

You wrong yourself, my Dear Brother, in saying that we "fulminate anathemas and curses against all who hold a slave." We have never employed such weapons against any man;—and our "Address" speaks for itself.

I come now to notice your astounding statements that you "have bestowed upon the subject the most serious and devout attention,—have prayerfully examined your Bible, and are perfectly satisfied that God has authorized those domestic relations [slavery] existing among you. This is tantamount to saying,—God has authorized two classes of relations, directly at war with each other. So fully has it been demonstrated that Bible matrimony, and southern slavery can not exist together, that the Savannah River Baptist Association, in 1836, declared the marriage of those whom God had joined together, and slavery had put asunder, to be null and void, and the parties to be at liberty to marry again,—thereby licensing adultery, as defined by the Son of God himself (Matt. 5—32). How can you believe that God has instituted the family relations, and yet be "perfectly satisfied" that He has "authorized" a system which tears them up by the roots?—that He has enjoined the respective duties belonging to these relations, and then approved of other relations, which render the discharge of those duties impossible? If, as slavery assumes, the wife is the property of her Master, under his control, and at his disposal, she cannot obey God, by cleaving to, and loving her husband,—for the Master has as absolute a right to interfere, at any time, (as he so frequently does) and to separate them, as he has to separate the males from the females of his flock. If children are the property of their master and subject to his will, the father cannot bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God, when the master's interests and irresistible authority require them to be trained up for the market. God commands "children to obey their parents," and "wives to obey their husbands." But slavery forbids it. Did the mandate and the interdiction proceed from the same source?—did that high and hallowed "fountain of authority send forth sweet and bitter waters?" "God forbid." Either the Bible nullifies slavery, or slavery nullifies the Bible. The clashing claims of these hostile relations can no more be reconciled, than the warring elements of nature can be brought into harmonious contact. Your assertion that "God gave his ancient people regulations for the purchase of slaves," is a groundless assumption. Had you said, He gave them directions for procuring their servants, it would have been correct. But you have no right to substitute the former for the latter;—such a license would convert all our northern domestics, the President of the United States and all the officers of government, the servants of the people, into goods and chattels,—yea, yourself, also, who are but a servant of the church. The term *slave* is specific, and applied only to an involuntary or chattelized man; while the word *servant* is generic, and applied to every person who does service, whether to a superior or an inferior. And so the Hebrew *ebed*, rendered servant, is applied to domestics, to subjects, to kings, and to the Messiah—(see 1 Kings 12—6, 7; Isa. 42—1, &c.) Nor has it been shown that it is *ever* used to denote a *slave*. But you say, the servants of the Hebrews "were their money"—that is, "bought with their money." So were their wives. The same original word expresses the act of procuring the one as the other;—hence the chattel principle is no more involved in the one case, than the other. They, also, "bought" their first born, who became, in that sense, "their money," but not their property. Joseph bought the Egyptians, and they sold themselves. The Hebrews also, when they became poor, sold themselves. But neither became articles of property—"chattels personal;" but they merely bound themselves to service, by voluntary and mutual stipulations. That the servants of the Hebrews entered and continued in bond service voluntarily, is evident from the fact that no force was authorized in obtaining them, and from the certainty that they could not have been constrained in such circumstances. What physical power had Abraham, who you say "was rich in slaves," to retain in involuntary bondage, "three hundred and eighteen trained and armed servants, born in his house?" The Mosaic economy appears to have lodged more power in the hands of the *servant* than the master; for, in case the servant was not satisfied with his situation, God made provision for his "taking care of himself." Besides, he went free at the Jubilee. The master could require him to continue in his service no longer.

[Continued on fourth page.]







Charleston, S. C., and more bitterly opposed to the Abolitionists, if possible, than Bro. Meredith, his successor.

N. H. Bapt. Reg.

From the report of the Warden of the Maine State Prison, it appears that the number of convicts in the institution on the 31st of Dec. 1840, were 68.

The number of convicts is the same as on Dec. 31, 1839; thirty were received, and during the year, there were discharged 21, pardoned 6, and died 3, making the same number.

Since the opening of the institution, July 23, 1834, there have been received into it as convicts, seven hundred and thirty-seven.

The whole expenses of the prison for the past year were \$11,006.35.

**Banks of Maine.**—According to an abstract of the returns from the Banks of the State of Maine, made on the first Monday of the last month, the amount of capital stock of the Banks paid in was \$4,371,500; amount of bills in circulation \$1,754,390; deposits on interest, \$136,909; not on interest \$733,834; due to other banks \$45,281. The amount of specie was \$269,729; due from other Banks \$600,804; bills of other Banks in the State \$146,550; out of the State \$67,187; notes and bills discounted \$6,820,792; real estate \$322,750.

**Shocking Affair.**—On Thursday of last week a man named Rufus Orcutt, was committed to the Bridewell in the basement story of the wooden block of buildings nearly opposite the Post Office in this place, on the complaint of his wife, that when intoxicated he had previously attempted to take her life, and had threatened to do so on the day the complaint was made. Soon after his imprisonment, the Bridewell was discovered to be on fire, and as soon as assistance could be obtained, the door was broken open and Orcutt taken out so dreadfully burned, that he was at first thought to be dead, but medical aid being immediately rendered, he was partially recovered, and survived until Sunday morning last. Orcutt is supposed to have been purposely set on fire with a match the straw deposited in the cell, thus causing his own death, and, but for a timely discovery, exposing the most populous part of the town to destruction by fire. Orcutt was formerly sentenced to the State Prison for life on the charge of manslaughter, but subsequently pardoned out. Having been imprisoned in the Bridewell when under the influence of ardent spirits, we understand that he had threatened to burn the building and himself if sent there again.

Hill's N. H. Patriot.

**Fire at Canton.**—The extensive establishment, known as the Bolivar Cotton Manufacturing Co., was entirely destroyed on Wednesday morning, both factory and store-house. The fire was discovered between one and two o'clock, and spread with a rapidity that left little opportunity for the preservation of property. Loss estimated at from \$25,000 to \$30,000, of which \$15,000 is insured. The Manufacturers office, in Boston. The principal proprietors are Messrs. Freeman Fisher & Brothers, and Jonathan Messenger of Canton.—Norfolk Dem.

At a meeting the presidents of the Bank of Virginia, the Farmers Bank of Virginia, and of the Exchange Bank of Virginia, at Richmond, and being authorized to act in the premises, by their respective boards, Jan. 15th, 1841.

**Resolved, unanimously** That the banks will resume specie payments simultaneously with the banks of Baltimore; and that the president of the Farmers Bank be requested to report this resolution to the banks of Baltimore, with a request that an early day be fixed upon for the resumption.

(Signed)

JOHN BROCKENBROUGH,

WM. H. MACFARLAND,

JAMES CASKEY.

**Horrid.**—Mrs. Mair, of Freedom township, Ill., on the 1st inst. in a fit of insanity, threw her infant in to the fire, by which it was burnt to a crisp! The little sufferer made frequent attempts to creep from the flames, but as often did the insane mother thrust it in again, until it perished amid the embers. Mrs. M. has heretofore been subject to fits of mental aberration.

The trial of Mrs. Sarah Ann Davis, at Philadelphia, for the murder of Julia Ann Jordan, occupied the court fourteen days; the jury retired on Friday at 2 o'clock, and had not returned a verdict at 10 o'clock the same evening.—Times.

**The Public Domain.**—The amount of unoccupied land in nine states is 154,000 acres, sold \$4,000,000, receipts \$37,000,000, cost to the nation in the purchase of Louisiana and Florida, in extinguishing Indian titles, removing Indians, Indian wars, agencies, offices, &c., \$109,000,000. The cost so far has exceeded the receipts \$12,000,000.

**Liability of Tenants.**—Heretofore it has always been understood to be good law that a tenant, occupying premises that were destroyed by fire, remained liable for the rent until the expiration of his term; but in the Marine Court, N. Y., on Monday, Justice Randall charged the jury that by recent decisions this doctrine had been overruled, and that the ousting of the tenant by fire exonerated him from the payment of rent from the date thereof. If this is a true law the people ought to know it.—Times.

**Supposed to be Lost.**—There are outstanding at the present time \$750,000 of the notes of the old United States Bank, most of which are supposed to be destroyed, as they have almost entirely ceased to make their appearance for redemption.

In the New York Court of Sessions, the Grand Jury has returned seven bills of indictment against J. B. Glentworth, for having paid or contracted to pay money for procuring persons to come from Philadelphia to New York, to vote in the Charter Election.

HON. GEORGE EVANS, on Tuesday last was elected by the Maine Legislature, a senator in Congress for the term of six years, from and after the 3d of March next.

There will be a total and magnificent eclipse of the moon in the evening of the 5th day of February inst., commencing at 7 o'clock, 9 minutes, and should the atmosphere be clear, it will present as sublime a spectacle as we seldom witness. The eclipse will commence at 7 o'clock, 9 minutes, in the evening, 2 hours and 6 minutes after the moon rises. It will be visible in all parts of the United States.

On Tuesday of last week, in the U. S. House of Representatives, a bill was passed, in the Senate, providing that the act of 1838 shall be construed so as to abolish imprisonment for debt, on process issued out of any Court of the United States, in all cases where, by the laws of the states in which the said Court shall be held, imprisonment has been or shall hereafter be abolished.—Olive Branch.

The Rev. Mr. Finley was lately arrested at Baton Rouge, charged with having used language in a discourse preached by him at a Methodist Camp-meeting, on the 8th of November in that parish, having a tendency to produce discontent among the free colored population, and insubordination among the slaves.

Perhaps, he said that God has "made of one blood all nations of men;" if so, ought he to be suffered to live?

**Retribution visiting the Guilty.**—It is stated in the Albany Evening Journal, that FURKON, the Grocer, in New York City, who went into Court a few years since, and committed voluntary perjury, by swearing that Robinson, the murderer of Ellen Jewett, was in his store on the evening of the murder, became a maniac and drowned himself! Who can resist the burnings of a guilty conscience.

## Christian Reflector.

"Charity rejoiceth in the Truth."

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1841.

### Explanation.

It is due to the brethren to whom our correspondent alluded last week in his comments on the Triennial meeting, that it should be stated that they have no idea of recognizing slaveholders in church fellowship by attending with them in the same Convention.

It is also due to the brother who has written respecting the contributions of Abolitionists to the missionary funds that it should be known that he wishes to have such contributions expressly designated by the donors, and exclusively applied to certain objects,—as, for instance, the mission to the Valley of the Niger.

—Mr. John C. Gore's Offer.—We shall be pleased to receive from some friend in Roxbury, a short account of the circumstances under which the offer of Mr. Gore, of a Meeting-house lot to the Baptists in that town, was made and rejected.

We suppose that the rejection is only another specimen of that wisdom which prefers peace with slavery above the interests of the oppressed; and we are glad that Mr. Gore has now decided the lot to the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society.

### Baptist Consistency!

As a Baptist, we are disposed to offer a few thoughts on our "strict communion" considered in connection with the practice of a part of the denomination at the North in relation to the fellowship with slaveholders, for which they so earnestly contend. And it may not be untimely for us to say here, that, unless we carefully guard against it, and skillfully shape our sentences, we may, by and by, be suspected of a disposition to withhold fellowship from slaveholders.

The Baptist may safely enough, among his brethren at least, assail the Pedobaptist mal-practices, with something more severe than the gentlest expression of his sorrow at the perversion, as he regards it, of one of the ordinances of the gospel. If necessary, Baptists may "sever the long established union" of the Bible Society;—and will not suffer themselves to be accused of uncharitableness for the act. But, suggest the calling of a Convention of Baptists from all parts of the country to take up the subject of slavery, and try it by that very gospel whose dictates were just now held in so high veneration and by whose laws every practice in other churches must be tested, under the comprehensive touchstone—"to the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to that word, it is because there is no light in them"—at the suggestion, alarm for "the union" springs up, and is uttered from many a grave adviser, who "would not disturb that question."

And, when the Convention is held, "few of the brethren of standing and influence" attend; it is an effectual effort is made by the rest, to quiet the apprehensions of the slaveholders, and to make them believe that those who participated in its doings, were "few and feeble."

Now, to us there is a strange mystery in this, which we are able to unravel, however; and we had better say that such conduct unravels one of the most dishonorable and inexcusable inconsistencies which ever disgraced any denomination of professed Christians. Will the Pedobaptist world be made to believe that there is any sincerity in our professed reverence of scripture authority, in our zeal for a correct Baptism, while they behold in us a total disregard of the same authority, as it bears, with two-fold greater force, from the very nature of the case, against the servile degradation of a single immortal soul? Will those Christians from whose fellowship we stand aloof, because they have not been baptized—immersed, as we understand it, lean with respectful attention and listen to our arguments, our exhortations, our rebukes of themselves, in this one matter, important as we may regard it, while they see us "sit down at the table of the Lord" with slaveholders, though they have been immersed?

We are not speaking against the Baptist practice of strict or separate communion. Our views on that question are too well known to need explanation. But to receive to our church fellowship the slaveholder, with all his crimes upon him, while we exclude Christians not known to have any other fault than that they have not been immersed, we are bold to confess before the world, is a most glaring and shameful inconsistency, and one which must inevitably nullify our argument for Baptist practice in the mind of all intelligent men of other connections.

If any of our brethren think us in error on this point, they have equal liberty to show it in our columns. Our desire, in making these remarks, is that Baptists may act up to their profession of high respect for gospel law, in order that what of truth they do hold, may be respected and received by others, as well as have a peaceful and happy indwelling in their own souls.

### The "Craft" in Danger.

"Faster than spring-time shows, comes thought on thought; And not a thought, but shivers, comes thought on dignity. My brain, more busy than the laboring spider, Weaves tedious snares to trap our enemies."

SHAKESPEARE.

How has it come to pass that the slaveholders look upon all the world as their enemies?

Go into the halls of our Congress, and you see a wakeful jealousy in every southern eye, and you hear the sharp suspicious tone, in the mouth of every southern speaker, the moment any allusion is made to "the patriarchal institution." Bluster, threats and personal abuse burst forth as suddenly as though assault were actually made at dead of night, with faggot and fire, upon their entire possessions.

Enter the great ecclesiastical assemblies of the land, where you might reasonably expect to see all calm, self-possessed and benevolent, even to the overlooking of much that had better not be said, where every great sin might expect its solemn unbiased trial, especially if it had stealthily entered the sacred precincts of the Church of the living God, whose people should "be holy as he is holy"—what do you witness, when some one, more faithful than "prudent," happens to "inquire whether Slavery is, after all, a divinely authorized state of human society?" and whether it ought to be cherished by the churches? Quick as thought, come rushing on your ear a multitude of im-

sioned-voices demanding "order!" and protesting "against the introduction of that question." In fact, men may not any more talk on that subject. It is the subject proscribed,—must not be canvassed. Discuss every other subject—charge intentional wrong on every other class of men—the discussion may be tolerated, the wrong-doer may be denounced. But, Slavery!—thy "delicate" features must be shielded from the slightest breeze that might blow upon them.

The mercantile men must everywhere consult for slavery, so that southern commerce may not suffer, or Slavery becomes "indignant" at the wrong done to her domains.

Manufacturers, as well as commerce, must consent to their prostration, if Slavery demands the sacrifice.

So the cultivation of the soil, in the remotest corner of the earth, must be interdicted to accommodate her. Victoria must not presume to cultivate, by free labor, the wide fields of her East-Indian colonies. She is now preparing to do this; for, though a species of slavery still exists there, for which, of course, there is no apology, yet British Abolitionism is on the stretch to apply to it the spear of Ithuriel, and the whole mighty project, so much the terror of the South, for over-marching America in the produce of cotton, we well know from the best sources, is based on the plan of employing free labor. This seems to be understood by the writer below, who says the enterprise is "cheered on by the fratricide Abolitionists."

With these few remarks, we offer to the reader an extract from an article lately published in the "Natchez Free Trader."

### Cotton-Growing in India!

"Of the startling fact that the East India cotton growing project is but a powerful organization, designed to overthrow the system of domestic slavery, in the American States, we have now the most ample evidence. This evidence we hasten to present to our readers; it is vitally important to the South, and merits all the deep attention which it will surely receive.

"The attitude of the South in sustaining the patriarchal institution of slavery at this moment is full of interest. England is arraying its vast moral, commercial and provincial power against us. The ocean queen is about to work her thirty millions of white slaves and serfs, in the jungles, and on the plains of India, for the express purpose of rendering the labor of three millions of black slaves in America, unproductive and of no value. This will be done. There is no vacillation, or weakness of purpose, in the English character. All India will, in a year or two, teem like a vast beehive with the cotton enterprise, cheered on by the fratricide abolitionists and mock philanthropists of the north."

Meanwhile O'Connell, the Irish agitator, is invoked to agitate his countrymen against slavery on this side of the water, while both in Ireland and England his roaring voice is perpetually lifted up in abuse of the noble-hearted, the independent, and the fearless Southern planters, as well as the American character at large.—The Kirk of Scotland thunders her anathemas against the American Presbyterians, because they will not excommunicate slave-owning church members. The Wesleyans and the Quakers are particularly using clerical influence against the rights and peace of our social institutions. The royal consent of the Queen of England is not ashamed to preside over the opening of a meeting, vauntingly called the "World's Convention," the chief business of which was to abuse American institutions—where Birney, once a slaveholder, and the negro Remond, side by side on the same platform, with the highest bishops of the church of England, and O'Connell, lifted up their voices, traitors as they are, against their own native land, all joining in full cry against a domestic institution which has come down unbroken from the "world's gray fathers," the holy patriarchs with whom angels walked and talked."

From the Christian Secretary.

**Mr. Editor.**—The following vote was unanimously passed at a recent meeting of the Baptist Church in New London:

**Resolved,** That the clerk of the church send the following preamble and resolutions to the Christian Secretary for publication. Whereas, the following ministers and lay brethren from abroad, viz: Deac. J. C. Lamb, 1st Church, Groton; Elder E. Denison and Deac. H. N. Fish, 3d Church do; Elder N. Wildman, Lebanon; Bro. Z. L. Smith, 1st Ch. Norwich; Eld. M. G. Clark, Bro. C. Deane, central Ch. do; Deac. S. Langworthy and S. Palmer, Stonington; Eld. F. Darrow, Waterford; Eld. Isaac Dwinell, Tolland; Eld. C. W. Denison, Eld. Abisha Samson, Worcester, Mass.; Dea. Daniel Goddard, do; Elder C. P. Grosvenor, do; Elder W. M. Doolittle, Sing, N. Y. did assemble in this city on the 29th, 30th and 31st of December last, and claimed to be an ecclesiastical council, invited by some thirty disaffected members of this church, to have their claims investigated, for the purpose of being constituted into a second Baptist Church, and contrary to our discipline and in violation to the feelings of the church. After being informed of the same by our committee, appointed for that purpose, and also to inform them that we believe the time has not yet come for such movement, and that said members were not in good standing at the time, they having violated their solemn covenant with us, and that we do not think they possess the requisite qualifications for a church of Christ, the said council did advise them to constitute themselves into a church as aforesaid, and then to receive into their fellowship seven others who had been excluded from us, and have publicly recognized them as a second Baptist Church. Therefore

**Resolved,** That in the opinion of this Church, the above named council did not take the best course to promote the cause of Christ, and that the result of their deliberations is not in conformity with the word of God or in accordance with Baptist principles.

**2d, Resolved,** That we disfellowship the whole of the proceedings of said council as interfering with our discipline, thereby destroying our independence as a church, and bringing us into contempt before an ungodly world.

**3d, Resolved,** That we disapprove of the act of the aforesaid disaffected members in constituting themselves into a separate church; and also for receiving into their fellowship seven others who had been excluded from us, and have publicly recognized them as a second Baptist Church. Therefore

**4th, Resolved,** That all those who have constituted themselves into a church as aforesaid, members with us, be considered from this time out from us by their own act.

**5th, Resolved,** That we do not recognize a second Baptist Church in this city, or fellowship such organization as a sister church, it not being in gospel order.

**6th, Resolved,** That whereas Eld. F. Darrow and N. Wildman did not concur in the advice mentioned in the preamble, we do not consider them under the censure contained in the second resolution.

**7th, Resolved,** That we consider the third resolution of the said council as published in the Secretary, a misrepresentation, and is calculated to convey to the public, that the church participated in their deliberations, and that they obtained from them all the facts as to the exclusion of C. C. Williams and others,—therefore we deem it our duty to state that we took no part with them, in the investigation, neither were called upon for any information concerning them; consequently they obtained no information from the church touching their case.

By order of the Church,

LEONARD DART, Clerk.

**Remarks.** We repeat the regret we expressed last week, that the foregoing statement has been made; and, if it were at all proper, we would not now go into any explanations which must necessarily show that the statement contains certain inaccuracies of essential importance to the case.

The reader will himself perceive that there is a want of harmony in items of the statement; viz. one contained in the 7th resolution, and the other in the preamble.

In the 7th resolution, it is stated that the report of the doings of the Council contains "a misrepresentation, and is calculated to convey to the public that the church participated in their deliberations;" whereas in the preamble, it is admitted that the church did give information to the Council "by a Committee," which was the fact; and "information" was repeatedly and earnestly called for from the church, "concerning" the entire difficulty and some "information" was obtained from the Committee of the church, which was communicated by that committee to a committee appointed by the Council, for the two committees had, at one time, an interview of more than one hour in the vestry of the First Baptist Church, where they could not learn that the moral character of any of the persons concerned had ever been questioned by the church, beyond the one matter of commencing the enterprise of establishing a new interest in the city, without asking the advice of the church, and persevering in it, after their petition for letters of dismission and recommendation was rejected; and it should be stated that the petitioners afterwards requested the church to unite with them in calling a mutual council, which was refused.

We are confident that no present member of the First Church would deem it at all safe to attempt a public impeachment of the moral character of any one of the persons who were constituted the Second Church with the approval of the Council, including Eld. C. C. Williams and the rest associated with him in the exclusion.

As a member of that Council, we feel no anxiety in regard to the result of any investigations of the case by those who may be disposed to make them in the spirit of candor and with a determination to know the whole truth.

In saying so much, and we might say much more, we have no wish to widen the breach existing before the Council were called to take up the case, and which it was the most fervent desire of the Council to heal.

In conclusion, we will express the hope that the churches in the vicinity of New London will cherish both the churches in that city, with fraternal affection.

### Fifty savings of Henry.

The woman was made of a rib out of the side of Adam; not out of his head to top him, not out of his feet to be trampled on by him, but out of his side to be equal with him, under his arm to be protected, and near his heart to be beloved. The man was dust refined, but the woman was dust double-refined, one remove farther from the earth.

**Dust thou art.** Man is a mean frail creature, little as dust, light as dust. Dust may be raised, for a time, into a little cloud, and may seem considerable while it is held up by the wind that raised it, but when the force of that is spent, it falls again. Grace does not run in the blood, but corruption does. A sinner begets a sinner, but not a saint a saint.

The bodies of the wicked, though only instruments of unrighteousness, shall partake of everlasting torments with the soul, the principal agent. The devil's instruments must share in the devil's punishments. Even the ox that killed a man, must be stoned. God hates sin, and those who entice others into it. It is a perpetual ban on Jeroboam that he made Israel to sin.

Satan's temptations are all treifagings, his arguments all fallacious, his affirmations all cheats. He is the tempter, and he is sinners. Let it increase our self-indignation that we should suffer ourselves to be beguiled by a known cheat and a sworn enemy.

For the Christian Reflector.

### Poetry the Handmaid of Liberty.

[From "Calliope," an unpublished Poem.]

BY C. W. DENISON.

And Liberty—sweet Liberty—whose birth is to each tenant of our free-born earth—Handmaids in sacred ties—twin sisters—born in twin affection on RELIGION'S morn; Hath a dear place in Poetry's free heart; For Liberty and Poetry can never part; If the staid axiom in truth be clad That undevout astronomer is mad, O! mad indeed must every Poet be Who hath no harp for holy LIBERTY!

Go where you will, at home, or far abroad; Search peasant's hut, or battlement of lord; Crowd through the city's haunts, rove in the wild; Ask the gray sire, or whisper to the child; And but one voice shall answer to your plea: That every Poet sings for LIBERTY.

From the sad notes that Jeremiah sang Amid the yokes he saw on Israel hang, To Homer's classics, when the galley bore The groaning bondsmen toiling at the oar, Down to the age when Cowper's muse awoke, And pealing thunders of Oppression broke, On to the hour when Bryant's lofty song, With gentle Whittier's, struck the captive's throng;

Where Chandler's prairie strains arouse the free, And Goulth's and Chapman's echo by the sea, Where youthful Davidson with Pierpont plays, And Child and Burleigh pour their ransomed lays; Hath God in Poetry the standard reared, That Mercy follows, and by tyrants feared—Heaven's own bright standard, never to be furled, Till wrong and outrage feed our fallen world!

Extract of a Letter.

Richmond Hill, Me. Jan. 27, 1841.

Dear Bro. Grosvenor,—I would write you something concerning the Convention at Topsham; but

ere this you have been apprized of what was said and done, on that hallowed occasion. It was a season which for interest far, far exceeded our own expectations.

I am now in the midst of a glorious revival of religion in this place, where I commenced my labors the first of the present year. I will not say how many have entertained hope of pardon; but from 70 to 80 are now known to profess an anxiety about their souls, who have heretofore been reckoned with the ungodly. More anon.

Yours for the Slave and all mankind:

L. CAREY STEVENS.

### Extract of a Letter dated,

Jan. 26, 1841.

Mr. Grosvenor,—I thank the Lord that ever there was an organ established at Worcester through which the friends of humanity may freely and frankly speak to their erring brethren upon the heaving-daring crime of chattelizing human beings, and through which too the poor care worn slave can have a hearing.

I hope from past success and from the anticipated glorious triumphs of truth, that every friend of the Reflector will put forth a more thorough and persevering effort on its behalf, and that we may have the pleasure of seeing before the close of the present year your subscription list doubled.

W. W. B.

### Brother Galusha's Letter.

We have room only to say of this able document, that whoever shall give it a thorough reading, will, we believe, acknowledge that, if he has paid \$2 for the 4th volume of the Reflector, he has at least the full value of his money in this one article. Who that can spare the money, will not send us immediately \$1,—\$5, to help us send extra copies of this letter through the country?

### Money!

Some money is yet due us for the present volume of the Reflector, and some even for the 3d vol. We very much need the money, or we would not remind our readers of these facts.

### A Card.

The undersigned would tender his warmest gratitude to the Ladies connected with his church and congregation, for their benevolence in giving him money to purchase a servant coat, also for some other articles with which he has been presented. May the Lord bless them for their kindness.

N. W. SMITH.

**Notice.** The ministers connected with the Wendell Association, will hold their next quarterly meeting with Mr. Samuel Everett in North Leverett on Wednesday, Feb. 17th, at 1 o'clock, P. M. Brother Henry is to preach.

L. RICE, Sec'y.

**Notice.** The Ashford Association Ministers meeting, will be held at West Woodstock, on the 2d Tuesday in Feb. next, at 1 o'clock P. M.

B. HICKS, Sec.

### BRIGHTON MARKET, Jan. 25, 1841.

[Reported for the Daily Advertiser and Patriot.] At market, 365 Beef Cattle, 90 Stores, and 860 Sheep, 25 Beef Cattle unsold.

**Prices.**—Beef Cattle.—Sales were very quick, and the prices obtained last week for some qualities were not sustained. We quote a few extra \$6.50; first quality \$6 a \$6.25; second quality \$5.25 a \$5.75; third quality \$4.25 a \$5. First quality \$4.25 a \$5. Sheep.—Lambs sold at \$2 and 2.50; Wethers \$3, 4.25, 4.50 and 5. Steers.—None at market.

### Married:

In Boston, Mr. Andrew C. Spring, of Charleston, to Miss Charlotte W. Carey, of Boston. Mr. Benjamin Sayer, to Miss Sarah A. Porter.

In Charleston, S. C. Samuel Frothingham, Jr., of Boston, to Miss Maria Louisa, daughter of J. B. Whitridge, M. D.

### Died:

In Boston, on the 16th inst., at the residence of his brother, Samuel Williams, Esq., aged 81—long known to the commercial community as a distinguished banker and merchant, in London, where he resided for 20 years.

In Providence, Col. Thomas Rivers, a member of the bar of Rhode Island, and for several years editor of the Providence Journal, died on the 15th inst. at his residence in the Navy Yard, Commander of the Providence, and died on the 15th inst. at that place, in the 47th year of his age.

In Cambridge, Mr. Andrew Whittier, said to only want one month of being 125 years old.—One year ago he reaped and shocked eight sheaves of wheat.

In Macon, Georgia, Jan. 3, where she had gone for her health, Mrs. E. S. Davis, wife of Mr. Charles Davis, Jr., and daughter of Jonathan Dorr, Esq. of Roxbury Mass.

In Shrewsbury, Jan. 26th, Fortunatus Harrington, 77. Although called suddenly and to his friends unexpectedly, yet to him death had no terrors. He had long waited for him as a welcome messenger.

And who should he have feared to die? He had faithfully discharged the great duties of life, he had attained to the full years assigned to man. Through life in all his business transactions he was strictly honest to the letter; no man could say the contrary.

As to his religious faith, it was founded upon the pure principles of the Gospel of Christ, a firm and unflinching friend to the cause of truth. He was a Baptist of the old school, having been united with the denomination more than forty years. Although strongly attached to the principles of his sect, he was an ardent defender of religious freedom. He was characterized for plainness in conversation, always speaking his sentiments without regard to fear or favor.

In his death, his children have lost a kind parent and a good counsellor, society a useful member, and the church a fearless advocate of the great principles of Christianity.—Comm.

### Lectures on the Scripture Types.

Will be published by subscription, a course of Lectures on the SCRIPTURE TYPES, by the Rev. JOSEPH SAMUEL C. F. FRET, author of a "Hebrew Grammar," "Hebrew Dictionary," "Joseph and Benjamin," &c. &c.

**Conditions.**—This work is to be published on the first of February next, in one volume, 12mo, neatly bound in cloth, containing not less than 400 pages, closely printed, with a clear type, and on good paper, with a new and striking portrait of the Author. Price \$1, to be paid on delivery.



er; but the servant could compel the master to keep him forever." Had the servants of the Israelites been the property of their masters, we should have had, at least, one instance on record, of their selling, or pledging them for debts, as is daily practiced at the South;—then, too, would there have been registered in Sacred History, at least, one instance of their attempting to assert their right to themselves, which occasions so much alarm among American Slaveholders. It would, also, be passing strange to find no instance of their escaping to the enemy (who were in most instances their own kindred), during the numerous wars of many ages. One of Abraham's servants was commissioned to select a wife for his master's son;—and one "born in his house," was the heir apparent to all his estate, before the promise of Isaac was given (Gen. 15-13). What! property inherit property!—Do your slaves inherit the estate of their masters, who have no children? Referring to Old Testament servitude, the apostle Paul says, "the heir, so long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all." Did he not differ from a slave—a saleable chattel? But the question is set forever at rest by God's peremptory command: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." (Deut. 23-15, 16). When you will arm your slaves, 319 to one master, unsupported by any state armament, and cease to require us to return them, if they escape, we will neither trouble you, nor ourselves, any further about your "domestic institutions." The North Slave will do all the rest. Read "the Bible against Slavery," an octavo volume published in New York, and if you do not relish all its keen irony, I will engage that, long before you shall have fairly overthrown its arguments, or destroyed its testimony, slavery shall be no more. I am utterly astonished at your saying,—"Jesus Christ came into the world, and saw slavery exist, yet he condemned it not;—and the Holy Ghost, after his ascent, expressly authorized it." What! "expressly authorized" the disciples of the Holy, just, and merciful Redeemer, to deny to their equal brother man, and fellow Christian, the attributes of his nature, and the rank of a rational being;—"expressly authorized" them to dispose of his labor, his person, his offspring, without his consent,—to use him as a mere appendage of themselves—a satellite to revolve about them? If Thomas Jefferson construed the New Testament as you do, I wonder not that he was a Deist. Speaking of slavery, he said, "I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just—That His justice cannot sleep forever—that the Almighty has no attribute that can take sides with the slaveholder." (Notes on Virginia.) If then, with you, he believed that every attribute of "Jesus Christ," and "the Holy Ghost," approved of slavery, and that they "expressly authorized it," how could he identify their attributes with those of Deity? Or, how could he credit their testimony, if in his view, it palpably contradicted that of Deity, engraven on the deep and imperishable foundations of the soul—the Heaven taught instinct of man's moral nature? He knew that slavery, when fairly tried at the bar of human conscience, was uniformly condemned. While, therefore, he regarded Deity as the author of that exalted nature, which, on the application of the chattel principle to itself, shrieks out against the attempt to murder its immortal attributes;—how could he believe Him to be, at the same time, the author of a revelation which should justify the horrible outrage? But our blessed Lord is not guilty of the charge which you virtually prefer against Him. He is not thus recreant to the claims of justice and humanity. He has not waged a war of extermination upon the distinctive properties, nor put a veto upon the improvement of the deathless soul He died to redeem.

You would be no more inconsistent to say that "Jesus Christ came into the world, and saw" the practice of emasculation "exist, and yet, He condemned it not;"—and claim his sanction of that detestable abomination, on the same ground that you do for Slavery. For, he distinctly and publicly "recognized" that act; and yet, according to your logic, "He condemned it not." But I maintain that He condemned that and Slavery, and every other crime, in the summary command—"All things, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." (Matt. 7:12). This certainly forbids our doing any thing to others, that we might, justly, be unwilling to have them do to us. Did He not, then, "condemn" the infliction upon an innocent fellow being, of that, from the suffering of which, every man would instinctively shrink back with horror? And who would feel that his nature was more outraged by an impious attempt to deprive him of the physical, than the intellectual and moral attributes of his manhood? Could you be made to believe it right for another to hold you as a slave, and to advertise you as a "runaway," for obeying your own will under the broad charter of Heaven to man, in the exercise of your powers of locomotion? Is it possible, in the nature of things, for one man to choose to be governed by another's will, instead of his own? You, perhaps, may ask if it be not contrary to nature, for a man to desire to be poor, in preference to being rich;—and whether that implies an obligation upon you to make him rich? I admit that it does not;—but it unquestionably implies sin in you to make him poor,—whether by taking away his property, keeping back his wages, or restraining his liberty. Let us paraphrase the two following prohibitions of Jesus Christ, in accordance with his alleged approbation of Slavery. "Ye know that they which are accustomed to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you." Yet, ye may exercise lordship and sovereign authority, over whole plantations of slaves;—and, if a portion, or the whole of them, belong to my kingdom, it matters not. Ye may unite with men of the world in making laws to prevent them from learning to read my word, and to punish any person for giving them the New Testament, which I am sent to seal with my blood. These practices, being lawful, will be right. Ye may use your own brethren for your own benefit while ye live, and then, leave them as the property of your children, or to be advertised and sold, at public auction, in the same list with your lands, your horses, your mules, and your carriages. (See the advertisement of Dr. Furman's estate.) "Neither be ye called masters; for, one is your master, even Christ." "Nevertheless, ye may be masters, in the most absolute sense. As to the spiritual privileges of my kingdom, ye shall not exercise a particle of authority over your fellow disciple; but ye may trample down all his natural rights;—ye may crush his spirit;—ye may subject him to your own arbitrary will;—ye may annihilate the distinction which I have made between him and a brute. Although I came to establish justice and mercy, throughout the world, ye are not to consider me as embracing the black man within the pale of humanity; notwithstanding I "made of one blood all nations of men," and stamped them alike with the broad seal of immortality.

Which of our holy commands? Is it that of washing his disciples' feet? The principle of your assumption that Jesus Christ approved Slavery, because "He saw it exist, and yet did not (by name) condemn it," if carried out, would make Him the minister of sin; for He

was conversant with other most atrocious acts which he did not thus condemn. When informed by the disciples who buried the body of John the Baptist, of his decapitation by Herod, he uttered no rebuke. Is that silence to be construed into approbation of the bloody deed? The perfidious oath of Peter He did not formally "condemn;"—nor did He thus "condemn" either the illegal arrest, the cruel scourging, the buffeting or crucifixion of himself. Do you say, He had special reasons for so treating the above cases? So say I of Slavery. How far his being charged with a design to subvert Caesar's Empire, and establish himself upon the throne of a civil kingdom, influenced his conduct, it may not be necessary for us to determine. It is enough to know that His moral precepts strike their death-fangs, into the very heart of Slavery; and, that there is no Caesar's kingdom to interfere with our freedom of speech, or action, against it. We live in a republic;—are ourselves law-makers;—and must each sustain a share of responsibility for the moral character of our statute-book, as well as for the discipline of the Churches with which we are connected.

And, yet, you seem to think that, by disavowing the imbruting of God's image, as contrary to his revealed will, we are "offering direct insult to the unchangeable and Holy One of Israel." If so, then we must lie under that charge, till God gives us a different moral constitution, or authorizes us to construe his word, we think you do, in direct violation of its pervading spirit and positive injunctions.

How could you, my Dear Brother, say that the "Holy Ghost expressly authorized Slavery"? My moral sense is not less shocked by this declaration, than would have been my intellectual, had you affirmed that the Zenith and Nadir occupy the same point in the heavens. The Holy Spirit "expressly authorize" the sin of divorcing man of his humanity;—of plucking off the crown of glory which his Creator placed upon his head,—wresting him from the sphere assigned him, as a free moral agent of God's government,—invading the sanctuary of his domestic rights, and trampling its sacred altar in the dust;—paralyzing the immortal energies of his mind, and dooming him to the condition of a soulless thing;—opening the sluice ways of vice and pollution, which inevitably roll their desolating tide through the length and breadth of Slavery! "The Spirit of Truth expressly authorize" the falsification of that self-evident truth, which has been proclaimed to heaven and earth by the trumpet voice of this whole nation;—that truth, in vindication of which, our revolutionary fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor;—that truth on which they planted their standard, and in Jehovah's name risked the issue, arraying the feeble forces of infant Colonies against the embattled legions of a mighty empire,—that truth to whose triumph you and I owe our freedom, and which inspires the song of our Nation's Jubilee,—that truth that makes the hearts of tyrants quake with fear, and which will one day be as terrible to slaveholders as the hand writing on the palace wall of Belshazzar! and, is that a truth a falsehood? Has "the Holy Ghost expressly" taught us so? Then, let us rend the stripes, and extinguish the stars of our National banner. Let us pluck every plum from our proud and soaring Eagle. Let us put on sackcloth and ashes, and fill the land with wallings! for, we are in a fearful condemnation, if, indeed, we have sinned against the Holy Ghost, by grafting our republican institutions upon that specious falsehood, that the "Creator has endowed all men, with an inalienable right to Liberty."

But where has the Holy Ghost given assurance of the right of man to hold property in man?—or, in so many words, that Slavery is just, and God approves it? Nothing short of that would be "express authority." The Apostle's "prescribing the duties of Masters and servants" (the latter you, without the least authority, call "slaves") is no warrant for slavery. The Greek *doulos*, rendered servant, is a generic term, and is applied to all persons who render service to others, from the most servile to the most exalted station. Our Savior took upon himself the form of a *doulos*, but not of a slave. Paul was the *doulos* of Jesus Christ James the *doulos* of God, &c. It is an inviolable rule of biblical interpretation, when a word in the original has several legitimate meanings, to adopt that which best accords with the whole tenor of the Sacred Scriptures. Hence the translators of the New Testament, when the domestic of Christians is denoted, have, in every instance, rendered *doulos* servant. Masters and servants are to be found in every part of the world, where Slavery does not exist; and, whatever that relation was in the apostolic churches, it has never been proved that there was a chattel-slave, much less a human-chattel-holder, in one of them. And had there been, the apostle's "prescribing" (some of) their duties, would not have been the "express authority of the Holy Ghost" for slave-holding,—nor indeed, any authority: The evil might only have been suffered to continue for a time (under the Roman government), as divorce formerly had done, and polygamy, probably, then did. May we regard the Apostle's "prescribing the duties" of husbands and wives as "the express authority of the Holy Ghost" for a plurality of wives which he "saw exist" and "did not (directly) condemn"? Do you say that the conjugal relation then subsisted, independently of that plurality, and his instructions might refer to such cases? I reply, the relation of Master and Servant then existed, distinct from chattel-slavery, and the injunctions respecting it might have applied to such instances.

You submit to us that the rule, "love, your neighbor as yourself" necessarily requires, not that the master should manumit his servant any more than that one of us should divide our property with our neighbor who is poor." Now, I submit to you, that if my property rightfully belonged to my "poor neighbor," who had been robbed of it by violence, and I knew the fact when I took possession of it, if I did not restore it to him, every farthing I should most palpably violate the sacred rule. And that is precisely the case with the Master. He knew, when he took possession of his slaves, that they owned themselves,—that they held a deed from the Almighty, written with his own finger, upon the tablets of their constitution,—that they had been deprived of self-possession by brute force. Still, he holds these helpless poor as his property, by a morally fraudulent title. Is not your denial that the above "rule" forbids grasping your defenceless neighbor (who owes you nothing, and has committed no crime), as your absolute property, and controlling his person, his interests, his issue, by your own will, "a lamentable evidence of the power of prejudice"? You say "this is the only passage we attempt to bring from the Bible," and yet, you devote a whole paragraph to animadversions upon another text quoted in our address. But, had more been necessary to support a self-evident truth, we could have filled our sheet with appropriate selections;—such as the following. "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Did not the stealing, the selling, and the holding, all involve the same principle, constitute the same crime, and expose to the same punishment? Again: "Let the oppressed go free,—break every yoke."—"Rob not the poor because he is poor."—"Deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor."—"What doeth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."—He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker." In short, every passage which condemns fraud, extortion or injustice, condemns slavery, which defrauds its victims of their earnings, extorts their labor, and cleaves down their inherent rights.

Whether you consider us "serious," or not, in intimating that the "itinerant apostles were too busy in draining off the universal deluge of idolatry, explaining the nature of the one living God, and establishing the claims of Jesus Christ, as the true Messiah, to define, or to condemn in form, every species and variety of crime, in every age, that hell, fruitful in inventions, might suggest, and fallen human nature perpetrate,—and that hence, horse-racing, gambling, piracy, the run traffic, and the African and American slave-trade, remain ungraduated in the scripture

scale of human sins"—you, nevertheless, condemn every other crime here enumerated, on the same ground that you do Slavery,—notwithstanding "the scriptures were given for all ages." While you regard the African slave trade as "piracy and treason," we view the American, as its legitimate offspring, and consider those who furnish victims for either, alike morally guilty.

But you ask if the Apostles "do not expressly recognize slavery, and under inspiration utter God's will respecting it?" I answer, certainly not more distinctly than others, which they no more "expressly" condemn. Paul "recognized" polygamy, and, "under inspiration, uttered God's will" concerning it,—that "a bishop must be the husband of one wife"—but he did not "expressly" condemn the practice in others, or even dissuade them from it. If you say, he did not "expressly" declare all God's will on that subject, which is embraced in general principles elsewhere taught in his word. So say I of slavery. But you ask again, whether "the Apostles published from God, the rules by which Christians admitted into the church, should be governed in gambling and piracy?" Just as clearly as they did rules for buying, holding, raising for market, and selling their fellow men and fellow disciples, as "goods and chattels." They no more defined, or vindicated the relations, principles, or practices belonging to the system of human chattelism, than those of a piratical combination, or a gambling club. If any of the servants addressed by the apostles, were held as property, exhorting them to obedience, no more justifies their Masters in holding them in that relation, than our Savior's teaching his disciples, when smitten on one cheek, to turn the other, sanctions the conduct of the smiter,—or when compelled to go a mile, to go twain, justifies him who uses such compulsion. On the same principle, I would exhort your slaves to obedience and forbearance,—only adding, in Paul's words, if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. I find but two instances in which the apostles addressed Masters, as such, in any way. In both these cases they were doubtless Christians, and the reciprocal duties enjoined on the parties, are perfectly inconsistent with the existence of property relations; and equally so with involuntary servitude. In the first instance, masters are commanded to "do the same things" to their servants, as the latter were required to do to them,—with the assurance that their "Master in heaven was no respecter of persons." Could this be said of masters and slaves? Though their stations were different, they were to regard each other as voluntary and accountable beings, and, as such, respect each other's personal rights, and promote their mutual interests,—which could not consist with one party's being subject to the other's will, as a transferable article of property. In the other instance, it is enjoined upon the Masters "to give unto their servants that which is just and equal, knowing that they also have a Master in heaven." This injunction is of the same import as the former, and entirely excludes the chattel principle. In each case in which Christian Masters are addressed, they are referred to Christ as the pattern of their treatment of their servants. And, did that gracious Master treat them as slaves—or as voluntary servants, with all the privileges, and all the honor of sons? This "giving unto servants that which is just and equal," you say, in our view, "means to emancipate them, and get to the Prairies and the wilderness." By no means!—You entirely misapprehend us. It does not mean emancipation, for the evident reason that these servants were not slaves, which is plain from the fact that justice and equity are enjoined, as consistent with their relation; and neither of these have any thing to do with the relation of property to its owner. What is justice to a horse, or equity between a man and his ox, or his slave? And yet, you call it a palpable perversion of the scriptures "to regard the above injunction as opposed to the system of human chattelism; and say, you 'hope many slaves receive what is just and equal, and in some cases more.' It was safest for you to use the word 'work,' as that is a term which relates to what is not realized. You go on to enumerate the various privileges granted to that small minority of slaves who are the rarest exceptions from the general rule of treatment, and seem to claim therefrom, satisfaction of the demands of justice for the great body of poor outcasts from the friends of humanity;—forgetting that the principle of remuneration does not enter into the system of slavery, and that all which is done for the slave, that is not for the master's benefit, is a work of mere supererogation in her account, and must be set to the credit of religion, attempting to build up what her antagonist, Slavery, pulls down.

If you would see what sort of justice and equity, the American system to which you have set your seal, administers to slaves, why not look at the mass, concerning whom, justice is a thing never inquired after. You speak of "gifts" to a slave—as though you were not aware of slavery's dire decree, that he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but what must belong to his master." [Civ. Code of Louisiana.—Art. 35.] Such is the justice and liberality of the system. Is that the equality enjoined by the above command? O! My Brother, with all the kindness of such amiable masters as yourself, there is mingled the crying, and perpetual injustice, of withholding the dearest of all personal rights, Liberty! What would tempt you to part with it? Think of the estimate God has put upon it. Why did he command that the stealer of an ox should restore twice fold, and the stealer of a man should be "put to death"? Because property can be a recompense for the loss of liberty;—but human Liberty is priceless. How, then, can you give your slaves "that which is just and equal," while you withhold from them that for which you can give no equivalent?

In view of the *no* which the apostle James pronounced upon those who kept back the wages of their laborers, how can you satisfy yourself that you are practising justice and equality towards your "laborers," while you not merely "keep back their wages," but "keep" them in a relation, which prohibits the payment of "wages"? What is the equality between two moral agents, one of whom is entirely subject to the will of the other? What is the equality of two husbands and two fathers, one of whom has the absolute control of the wife and children of the other, in addition to the protection and enjoyment of his own? Or, what is the justice of one man's living like a prince, and others like beggars, when all are supported mainly by the compulsory labor of the latter? This distinction is of a perfectly different character from all those arising from other causes, when all classes are free.

In the 1 Epistle to Tim. 6th Ch.—1st and 2nd vs.—the apostle specifies two classes of servants, each of which were disciples. The first were "under the yoke," either of slavery, of bond service for life, or a shorter period, by mutual contract, or hired service, or apprenticeship, (no man positively knows which). If they were slaves, the yoke consisted in the nature of the relation;—but, if they were bond, or hired servants, or apprentices, the yoke consisted in the arbitrary character or severe treatment of their masters, who were, evidently, unchristian. These servants were exhorted to count their masters worthy of all honor, for the express reason "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Nothing is said of the right of their master to exact that honor.

The second class of servants were, obviously, not under the yoke;—because the apostle distinguishes them from such. If they had formerly been slaves, they could not still have been under the yoke, since their masters had become believers.—For God's people, under the Old Testament dispensation, were required to "break every yoke," and to "put away the yoke," as a moral duty. (see Isa. 58-6, 9). Believers under the New could do no less. If they had been, and continued to be, bond, or hired servants, or apprentices, they could not still be under the yoke of arbitrary and unjust masters, as their masters had become pious "brethren," kind, and "faithful" to their obligations. The servants of such were exhorted not to get above their station, and "despise their masters" who

were "beloved, partakers of the benefit," because they were raised to a common brotherhood with them. If they had once been in the slave's condition, and by the conversion of their masters had been freed and elevated, they should not go to the opposite extreme,—grow insolent, and abuse their liberty. My Dear Brother, the image of chattelism servitude which you see, is not in the apostolic churches, but on the glass of education.

You say, you "do not speak of the abuses of slavery." Nor do I. I know nothing of its abuses, nor how it can be abused,—for it is itself one of the mightiest engines by which the Prince of darkness works wickedness among men. There is no kind of evil which it does not produce, and no cruelty which it does not sanction; although good men do not use the full license it gives them. Let a wicked master commit any outrage upon his slave, to which malice, rage, or lust can stimulate him, in the presence of a hundred cold witnesses, Slavery legally gags every one of them, and, spreading her broad and bloody shield over his guilty head, intercepts the stroke of justice, and bids the heartless wretch exult, amid the shrieks of his trembling, bleeding, expiring victim! Were it demanded, it would be easy to fill an authentic volume, with deeds of violence and pollution, at which humanity weeps, and virtue bleeds,—none of which are "abuses of slavery," but her abuses of her hapless victims.

You ask if it would be "just to urge the conduct of brutal husbands and parents, against the conjugal and parental relations?" Certainly not; for the good reason, that there is nothing in the nature or influence of those relations which either allows, or tends to produce brutality;—but, on the contrary, they furnish the safeguards of mutual affections, and mutual interests, while the logic of righteous law defends the weaker parties. How different the condition of the human chattel, from whom the ruthless hand of slavery has torn away the last shred of protection!—And how depraving the effects upon the master!—Thomas Jefferson, who was well acquainted with the subject, says,—"The whole commerce between the master and the slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. The man must be a prodigy, who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances." [Notes on Virginia.] Such are the legitimate fruits of slavery. What, then, are its "abuses"? When, in apparent palliation of the cruelty of rendering asunder kindred ties, you say, "the separation of parents and children must occur with all men, after the latter are grown up," do you mean to insinuate that it is no greater evil for the offspring of slave parents to be torn from their heaving bosoms, amid the wailings of agony, and the wild bursts of despair, than for the young freeman to remove his smiling bride from the paternal habitation, to the cheerful fireside of his own "sweet home"? Suppose some human flesh-monger should tear your own dear boy from your fond embrace, would it console you to be told that he would have chosen to occupy his own domicile after he should have arrived to the age of manhood?

In asserting that "such instances of inhumanity are not as frequent at the South as in the Factory System," must we understand, that you regard it as inhuman for parents and children voluntarily, and temporarily, to separate for mutual benefit, as for those who make merchandise of their fellow creatures, to snatch children from their mother's arms, and bear them away to a remote distance, to toil, and suffer, and die among strangers in a strange land? Did you ever hear of a mother who, to prevent her children from entering a Northern Factory by their mutual consent, severed their heads from their bodies; as did that frenzied slave mother in the District of Columbia, who dreaded the living death of her dear offspring, (who had just been sold, and were about to be removed to the far off human-market,) more than such an awful, but speedy termination of their sufferings? But, you should know that there is little occasion for even voluntary, and temporary separation of families, in the Factory system. Generally, there is connected with each establishment a handsome little village of commodious and neatly painted houses, (very unlike your negro-huts at the South,) erected expressly for the accommodation of the entire families of the operatives where parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters dwell together in mutual love, and labor, free and merry as the birds of spring.

You say, "as to husbands and wives, the church in your place would deal with a member who should put asunder those whom God has joined together." Then, they would attack as essential a right as the slaveholder possesses, and make deadly war on your Divine Institutions. What! not permit the putting of a man and his wife asunder, and yet, allow the putting of a man and himself asunder? Slavery puts away the man, and leaves only the thing.

Finally, you say that "the separation of parents and children, and husbands and wives, are both abuses," and "you have long wished your legislature would prohibit them." Why, My Dear Brother, from whose feet are planted on the sunny summit of Liberty, cannot explore the murky vale of slavery, stretching along its base, without "descending." But, do you dispute the facts of such shocking exhibitions? You "ask us to come and see." We need not go so far.—We can see the "chained coffee," and the branded "lash" from the windows of our National Capitol. Listen to the testimony of a Committee of the Synod of Kentucky, one of your sister slave states, appointed to report upon the subject in 1834. They say, "brutal stripes, and all the various kinds of personal indignities, are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses."—"There is not a village, or road, that does not behold the sad procession of manacled outcasts, whose chains, and mournful countenances tell that they are exiled from all that their hearts hold dear." "You engaged that if 'we would show you these, as a part and parcel of your institution, you would unite with us in condemning that institution, as shocking." Now lift up your voice at once, and pronounce the sentence;—for slavery "licenses" these things, and their universal abandonment would be her total extinction.

The terror of the lash, the chain, and the prison, elsewhere employed, to supercede their use in the slave paradise of Beaufort;—but, without their aid, how impotent would be an attempt to transfer your favored "servants" to the South Western Market, which they so justly dread as the "hell" of American Slavery?

Our repudiation of that system of abominations, you regard as the first step in a course, which must soon divide our hitherto happy union, as Baptists, in fragments, most hostile and vindictive.

However you may feel towards us, we pledge ourselves, by Divine assistance, never to cherish hostility or vindictiveness towards you; while we utter our honest, decided, public, and perpetual remonstrance, against your daring invasion of the high prerogative of Jehovah, by arrogating to yourselves that power over his creature, which belongs to himself alone; and, by setting down your brother man, as an item in the inventory of your estate. If our disavowal of that impious and brutalizing practice, and your persisting in it, produces a separation, much as we shall regret such a painful event, we cannot purchase union at the price of conscience.

You say, "God has cast your lot in a land where you find two distinct races, who can never amalgamate, and one of which must be master." "Can never amalgamate?"—When a portion of the blacks have become so highly enlightened, that they can be identified only (as the law directs,) by the condition of their mother? "Can never amalgamate?"—When the process is advancing so rapidly, under the inspiring genius of slavery, that Henry Clay (in his famous Congressional speech,) evidently alludes to it as the great vortex, which, in a state of short that he estimates it, will swallow up both races? O! that they could not "amalgamate!"—then would wicked masters cease to sell the fruit of their own loins! "One of which must be master!"—notwithstanding both races have so long existed in our Northern States, England, and elsewhere, in a state of freedom, and now exist in the British West Indies, in the proportion of 11 to 1, without "either being master?" I predict, that, if slavery be perpetuated in the United States, neither of these, but a middle race, in whose veins rolls the fiery blood of their chivalrous sires, will be master. Already is this issue feared by some in that portion of the slave territory, where these re-

sive spirits are rapidly increasing, by the double process of emigration and "amalgamation." You are "not only astonished that the word of God justifies the institutions now existing, but that the African is in the happiest condition he can now occupy." If both these propositions are true, and you are bound to protect the happiness of the African race, is it not your duty to recall those you have sent to Liberia, since so many natives as you can, arrest every free black man within your reach, and force them all into one blessed Eden of Slavery? And, seeing you are "satisfied" that God approves this merciful system of involuntary FELICITY!—why not extend its friendly arms to embrace all the defenceless of every complexion? Are the Africans alone entitled to such affectionate regard?

Had a peal of thunder from the cloudless heavens burst upon your ears, it would scarcely have been more astounding than the following sentence from your pen. "I speak understandingly, when I say that, with a humane master, he has far less labor, much greater privileges, more leisure, and practically more liberty than any peasant in the world." Then, the happy slave has not only as little labor, and as much leisure as he chooses, the privilege of receiving and appropriating the avails of his industry, holding real and personal estate, being his own master, protecting his wife, educating his children, choosing his residence, his society, his place of worship, his books, his amusements,—projecting and executing plans for his own happiness and that of his family,—enjoying the dignity and security of independent manhood, the right of suffrage, eligibility to any office not which his talents, attainments, character, and industry qualify him; and rising, as many of the humblest of our northern "peasants" have done to the most respectable rank in society, the first class of capitalists, and the highest officers of state,—but to something above and beyond all these, which are but the pitiable "peasant's" portion.

What, then, are the superabounding privileges and immunities of the slave, who has "a humane master"? The signal advantages of being a vendible commodity, unknown to a person,—of being pursued as a fugitive, and punished as a felon, for absconding himself without his master's leave,—of having his earnings clutched with an unsparring hand, and appropriated to another's benefit,—of being legally denied the simplest elements of education, of being struck off to the highest bidder of the auctioneer's hammer, when his master feels in business, or dies insolvent; with the glorious chance of falling into the hands of a ruthless villain, and meeting a premature death, in one of the "merciful openings" in the far West;—and, to crown the climax of his felicity, in a dying hour, the cheering prospect that his posterity to the latest generation, will be ranked with brutes. Is this speaking "understandingly?" Is this the happiest slave you can find; let me show him the filthy farm, neat and comfortable dwelling, loving herd and bleating flock, prancing steeds and gentle carriages, crowded barns and overflowing granaries of one of our Genesee "peasants,"—all the fruit of his own labor, then offer your favored slave the same condition,—if he spurn it with contempt, turn on his heel, and hasten back to Elysian bondage, I will allow that you have placed a just estimate upon his happiness. Then, too, must it be acknowledged that the whole world would be a more egregious blunder, in using the word "slaves" to express the utmost contempt; and to denote the lowest, meanest, and most wretched condition in human life. (Did the masterly Clay hurl the wrong bolt, when, in severe retort upon Calhoun in the Senate, he said, "I would not own him for a slave!") Then it will also be proved that Liberty is a lie!—and that the famous "pecuniary" of the North should rather occupy a famous flag of Freedom, and rally to the glorious standard of slavery.

You "submit to us that it is as manifestly gratuitous for us to assume to ourselves any accountability for your social and political system, as that of Burmah." This reminds me of the remark of one who, on being rebuked for profane swearing, said,—"I am not your business;—it is your business to injure me;—I am the faithful man replied, 'yes, it will injure me, if I do not reprove you.'" God has said, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him." We are likewise commanded "not to be partaker of other men's sins,—to keep ourselves pure, and to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." (Lev. 19-17-1 Tim. 5-2 Eph. 5-11.)

In Ezekiel 3rd and 33rd chapters, with awful solemnity, the Lord declares that the watchman who sees the sword coming, and gives not warning, shall be guilty of the blood of the slain. Standing upon the watchtower, we have seen the sword of Divine vengeance high uplifted, flashing its death-gleams abroad. We have heard the blast of Jehovah's trumpet, whose thunder tones are breaking the criminal slumbers of the world. We verily believe that the day of slavery's retribution is at hand.—How, then, can we be guiltless without sounding the alarm? Have we no more connection with your Institutions than those of Burmah, while our commercial, political, social, and religious interests are all interwoven, and the withering blight of slavery comes over the north, like the scorching sirocco of Sahara? The thousands of your business and pleasure, seeking people, bring its infection among us. Its pestiferous influence is deeply felt in all our great marts, and watering places. Love of slavery's gold and silver corrupts our northern tradesmen, stifles their instinctive abhorrence of her odious principles, and converts some of them into her most eager apologists.—Her spirit of violence and contempt of authority is abroad in the land. Mobs at the North, as well as duels and assassinations at the south, are among the damning deeds of her instigation. Our sons and daughters are in your midst, exposed to her seductive influence, so well adapted to their natural pride, love of ease and power. And, often have they proved to us that

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien, As to be hated, needs but to be seen; Yet, seen too oft, familiar with her face, We first endure, then pity,—then embrace."

Does the "social and political system of Burmah" affect us thus? Has it silenced the voice of our petitions, rifled our Mails, or murdered our LOVEJOYS?

But, why do we send missionaries to Burmah? Is it to fellowship their system? or to induce them to abandon it? If the government of that country were republican, and our Missionaries were allowed to go to the ballot box, would you not withhold from them your support and fellowship, if they sustained the Burman system of idolatry by their votes, their preaching and the press?

I cordially unite with you in devoutly praying "God to grant us grace to consult our Bibles on our knees, and to follow that light shining in a dark place." And, I no less ardently pray that its blessed beams may soon shine in the dark faces, and still darker hearts, of more than two millions of our fellow beings, whom the laws of your "Domestic Institution" forbid to read its hallowed pages.

Well do you say, "if this were our only guide, what harmony would prevail, and in proportion as this torch is depressed or extinguished, passions and prejudice drive us into darkness and recklessness." And yet, that diabolical system which you support, and which, you say, God justifies, the patriarchs and apostles patronized, Jesus Christ did not condemn, and the Holy Ghost expressly authorized, brands as a criminal doomed to condign punishment, every one who has the audacity to place "this torch" in the hand of the slave, to guide him in his pathway to heaven,—lest he should run away in his light, on seeing himself to be a man.

Of the soundness of the demonstration in the fact, that nearly all the fugitives I have seen, were the Christian slaves of humane masters. The influence of your "peculiar institution" also excluded the portion of the light of "this torch" from the slaveholder's mind,—excites his "passions," fosters his "prejudice," and "drives him on into darkness and recklessness." Hear the testimony of a credible and competent witness. In his notes on Virginia, Thomas Jefferson says:—"The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to his worst passions; and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped with its odious peculiarities."—Hence their barbarous threats;—hence the declaration that "the subject of slavery shall not be discussed,"—hence the insecurity of person and life, to abolitionists whose business calls them to the South; while they seek no communication with slaves, and their only offence is the constitutional exercise of the freedom of speech with their white fellow citizens. Our sentiments cannot be more abhorrent to slaveholders than theirs are to us;—and still, the most violent of them, even those who offer

[Remainder on the second page.]

\* The property of the Rev. R. Furman, D. D. of your own State, and so well known in the Baptist denomination throughout the U. S. was advertised by his legal representatives, after his decease, as follows:—"Notice,—on the first Monday of February next, will be put at public auction, before the Court House the following property, belonging to the estate of the Rev. Dr. Furman.—viz. A plantation or tract of land on, and in, the Wateree Swamp. A tract of the first quality of fine land, on the waters of the Black River. A lot of land in the town of Camden. A library of a miscellaneous character, chiefly Theological. 27 Negroes, some of them very prime. Two mules, one horse and an old wagon. (O, tempora! O, mores! O, succedentes!)